

REMARKS

The present Amendment amends claims 8-13. Therefore, the present application has pending claims 8-13.

The drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR §1.83(a) and 37 CFR §1.84(p)(4) as allegedly failing to show various elements described in the specification. Filed on even date herewith are Proposed Drawing Corrections correcting Fig. 3 so as to identify the OS as reference numeral 150. Also, amendments were made to the specification particularly page 13 so as to describe element 43 as illustrated in Fig. 4.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to the drawings as not illustrating element 135 as described in the specification on page 29, lines 1 and 2. Element 135 is illustrated in Fig. 18 and as such is described on page 28, lines 11-15. Thus, element 135 is in fact illustrated in Fig. 18 and discussed in the disclosure.

In the Office Action the Examiner objected to the drawings alleging that reference numeral 31 and 31' have both been used to designate the modified apparatus. This incorrect as illustrated in Fig. 18 and as described on page 28, lines 5-8 of the present application, reference numeral 31' identifies an information security policy management and audit support apparatus 31' which is modified relative to the information security policy management and audit support apparatus 31 as illustrated in Fig. 2. The information security policy management and audit support apparatus 31' as illustrated in Fig. 18 is modified relative to the information security policy management and audit and support apparatus 31 illustrated in Fig. 2. The external storage device 13 of element 31' as illustrated in Fig. 18 includes the

constitution device information/security status database of management and audit 135 which is not a part of the external storage device 13 of the information security policy management and audit support apparatus 31 as illustrated in Fig. 2. At no point are these reference numerals interchanged. Therefore, the specification fully complies with the requirements of 37 CFR §1.83(a) and 37 CFR §1.84(p)(4). Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The abstract stands objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in the Office Action. Amendments were made to the Abstract to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants submit that this objection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 8-12 stand objected to due to informalities noted by the Examiner in the Office Action. Amendments were made to the claims so as to correct any informalities discovered upon review. However, the Examiner recommends amending the claims to include certain stylistic modifications (e.g., beginning each paragraph with a letter). Applicants submit that the stylistic modifications suggested by the Examiner are necessary in order for the public to be fully apprised of the meets and bounds of the features of the present invention as recited in the claims. Accordingly, the claims were amended to improve the language therein without the use of the stylistic modifications suggested by the Examiner.

Therefore, the objections to claims 8-12 are overcome and should be withdrawn.

Claims 8-13 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regards as their invention. Various amendments were made throughout claims 8-13 to bring them into conformity with the requirements of 35 USC §112, second paragraph. Therefore, Applicants submit that this rejection is overcome and should be withdrawn.

Specifically, amendments were made throughout claims 8-13 to overcome the objections noted by the Examiner in the Office Action. Particularly, amendments were made throughout the claims to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

The Examiner's cooperation is respectfully requested to contact Applicants' Attorney by telephone should any further indefinite matter be discovered so that appropriate amendments may be made.

Claims 8-11 and 13 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel (U.S. Patent No. 6,484,261) and further in view of Grimm (U.S. Patent No. 6,317,868); and claim 12 stands rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiegel, Grimm and further in Cert (the article entitled "CERT'S CC Vendor-Initiated Bulletins 1994-1998"). These rejections are traversed for the following reasons. Applicants submit that the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in claims 8-13 are not taught or suggested by Wiegel, Grimm or Cert whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to reconsider and withdraw these rejections.

Amendments were made to the claims so as to more clearly describe features of the present invention. Particularly, amendments were made to the claims to more clearly recite that the present invention is directed to a security management method and system for supporting security management of managing systems constituting an information system. According to the present invention, a plurality of security control names and names for obtaining the status/changing configuration of the security control means, information security policy management and inspection supporting device are provided so as to aid in the simplified control and management of security conditions of an information system while conforming to security policy. According to the present invention, the security management method and system inspects whether the managed system is constructed and operated in conformity to the policy established in the design phase of such information system and is able to make changes in configurations of the managed systems when there is a problem by feeding back such information identifying such problems to the security management method and system.

The above described features of the present invention now more clearly recited in the claims are not taught or suggested by Wiegel, Grimm or Cert whether taken individually or in combination with each other as suggested by the Examiner.

Wiegel teaches a graphical network security policy management method and system which supports the establishment of a security policy in the form of a decision tree that is constructed by assembling graphical symbols representing policy actions and policy conditions. As taught by Wiegel, a user modifies properties of the graphical symbols to create a logical representation of the policy while the

logical representation is transformed into a textual script that represents the policy and the script is displayed as the user works with the logical representation. The script is then translated into machine instructions that govern the operation of a network gateway or firewall. However, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Wiegel of providing security control means and means for obtaining status of security of different managed systems and to change configuration of the managed systems for controlling a security both during the design phase and during the operation phase as in the present invention. The system taught by Wiegel could support the establishment of security policies. However, the system taught by Wiegel is not intended to inspect whether the system operates in conformity to the security policy established during the design as in the present invention such as, for example, during operation of the system as in the present invention.

Thus, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a security specification hatching step of executing an information security policy which corresponds to each managed system constituting an information system designated by a user from a database describing a correspondence between information security policies representing policies of security measures with at least one managed system and the managed systems, to hatch security specification to be applied to the information system as recited in the claims.

Further, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a security diagnosis step of executing a plurality of audit programs describing a processing for auditing various information including a type of the managed and a software version, which are stored so as to correspond to each set of the information security policy and the managed system

which are specified by the hatched security specifications as well as by a security status to audit the various information including the type of the software version of the managed system constituting the information system designated by the user and diagnose a security of the information system as recited in the claims.

Still further, Wiegel fails to teach or suggest a security handling and management step of executing a management program designated by the user from a plurality of management programs describing a process for controlling the security status concerning the security policy of the managed system stored so as to correspond to each set of the information security policy and the managed system which are specified by the hatched security specifications to allow the electronic computer to change the security status of the managed system corresponding to the management program so as to adjust the security status to the information security policy corresponding to the management program as recited in the claims.

The above noted deficiencies of Wiegel are also evident in Grimm. Therefore, combining the teachings of Wiegel and Grimm in the manner suggested by the Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims.

Grimm teaches a process for transparently enforcing protection domains and access control as well auditing operations and software components. Grimm specifically teaches an introspection service for analyzing software component and an interposition service for correcting the software components as its constituents elements. Grimm the same as Wiegel fails to teach or suggest the above described features of the present invention regarding the providing of security control means

and means for obtaining the status and changing the configuration of the security control means in the appropriate manner relative to the security specifications. Thus, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Grimm of the above described features of the present invention regarding the security specification hatching step, the security diagnosing step and the security handling and management step as recited in the claims.

Thus, as is quite clear from the above both Wiegel and Grimm fail to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Therefore, combining the teachings of Wiegel and Grimm in the manner suggested by the Examiner still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claims 8-11 and 13 as being unpatentable over Wiegel in view of Grimm is respectfully requested.

The above noted deficiencies of Wiegel and Grimm are also not supplied by Cert. Cert is merely relied upon by the Examiner for an alleged teaching of security information published by a security information organization including Cert. Thus, at no point is there any teaching or suggestion in Cert of the above described features of the present invention regarding the security specification hatching step, the security diagnosis step and the security handling and management step as recited in the claims.

Thus, Cert suffers from the same deficiencies relative to the features of the present invention as recited in the claims as Wiegel and Grimm. Therefore, combining the teachings of Wiegel, Grimm and Cert in the manner suggested by the

Examiner in the Office Action still fails to teach or suggest the features of the present invention as now more clearly recited in the claims. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 USC §103(a) rejection of claim 12 as being unpatentable over Wiegel, Grimm and Cert is respectfully requested.

The remaining references of record have been studied. Applicants submit that they do not supply any of the deficiencies noted above with respect to the references utilized in the rejection of claims 8-13.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants submit that claims 8-13 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of claims 8-13 is respectfully requested.

To the extent necessary, the applicants petition for an extension of time under 37 CFR 1.136. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment of fees, to the deposit account of MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C., Deposit Account No. 50-1417 (566.39530VX1).

Respectfully submitted,

MATTINGLY, STANGER, MALUR & BRUNDIDGE, P.C.



Carl I. Brundidge
Registration No. 29,621

CIB/jdc
(703) 684-1120